

Re: CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008

To the Commissioners,

Although I understand your efforts to curb the problem of unsolicited bulk email, I am concerned about the proposed requirement for merchants to maintain 'suppression' lists. This almost sounds as though is borders on similar lists kept by such outfits as the KGB, God Forbid!

I do not mean to sound impudent here, but this is, after all, a FREE country, meant for the growth of free enterprise, self-growth (in a postive context), and growth - economically for our nation.

The use of the word "suppression" takes on a negative intonation out of the box, Commissioners. It denotes an attempt to suppress Free enterprise, innovation, self-motivation, economic growth from within (and without) of the country, FREEDOM in general.

It is hard for me to believe that this kind of RULE making is even being entertained. Do you really mean to "supress" us in our individual or collective efforts to improve our lives, invent, innovate, move ahead, become more independent, have better lives overall, and potentially provide a mean to open that same door to others? All in the name of "Can=Spam"?

I get huge numbers of email that I do NOT want. However, as an adult, I think - certainly, I hope, I am capable of pushing the right button - called DELETE, and do, when I do not wish to open the email(s) in question. This is something anyone is capable of doing.

This is so simple. It absolutely astonishes me that this is even being considered.

I also am fully aware there are those abroad in the land who seek to destroy free enterprise - for vicarious reasons. It is for THAT reason alone, above all others, that I am so adamant in my request this whole thing be reconsidered.

Look, I am and always will be proud to be an American. We stand for freedom. We stand for innovation. We stand for a way of life that others that really ARE suppressed, hope, dream, and pray for - and most of them include their desire to become one of our own. One of our own - like my grandparents, and probably your. Our ancestors, Commissioners. THEY came

here to start a new life, to follow their religion in freedom, to be able to actually make a dime. We have young men and women overseas as I write this, who are fighting for our way of life. It certainly is NOT a fight to suppress anyone.

Those young people had to grow up in one big hurry. Yet, even they have become aware of what our history has provided us and what that Freedom is about. Would you take that from them? Are they to return to a land that has thrown this wonderful opportunity to the winds like so much garbage?

I do not know who, in the flimsy name of CanSpam, would have not understood what such a change to one of the greatest innovations in history - the internet. It has opened new vistas of connecting with things, and especially with people we may never have known or had the chance to know. It has provided a means to maintain an open communication with old friends, family, and new friends that we never had before. It has given whole family's a means to get out of debt, make some valid earnings, move from ghettos to a better life, educated our children, and on. You would actually remove the one way that many have now to sustain a new way of life or a chance to get one? All in the name of CAN SPAM?

How about EDUCATING the ones who holler CANSPAM - kill the 'net? Show them, instead, how to use the delete key!!. Simple, but it works. Oh, it may take more time - like a nanosecond, but what the heck. If it preserves our basic freedoms of enterprise and the rest, it is at least worth that time.

In addition, there is a whole lot of problems and costs associated with this idea. The damage to us as buyers or sellers is beyond what you can possibly determine in mere monetary costs.

To REQUIRE suppression lists will seriously damage many of the legitimate publications available on the net. It certainly is harmful to publishers who require permission from the consumer prior to adding them to any list.

These are NOT the folks who CAN-SPAM was designed to put out of business in the first place, but this MANDATE will very likely have that effect.

There's no doubt in my mind of the potential AND significant harm to consumers. The problem is really one of properly knowing the intent of a consumer when they unsubscribe from a list. Besides this, these suppression lists could easily fall into the hands of spammers anyhow,

leading to more spam instead of less.

I was stunned at the potential problems this ruling could involve, that it came up in this manner AT ALL and urge you in the strongest possible terms to reconsider its implementation in light of these problems,

Respectfully, 

Ms. Dale J. Pettelle
[Redacted]
Michigan [Redacted]
United States of America

